

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable consideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 16-25 are presently pending in this application, Claims 1-15 having been canceled and Claims 16-25 having been added by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, the abstract of the disclosure was objected to because of informalities; Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Makino (U.S. Patent 4,160,897); Claims 2 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Makino in view of JP4-249090; Claims 4 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Makino and further in view of Caddock (U.S. Patent 3,881,162); Claims 7-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Makino and further in view of Caddock (U.S. Patent 4,670,734); Claims 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohe, et al. (U.S. Patent 6,256,876) and Makino; Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohe, et al. in view of Makino and further in view of Caddock ('162); and Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohe, et al. in view of Makino and Caddock, and further in view of McWilliams (U.S. Patent 3,699,649).

In response to the objection to the abstract, the abstract has been rewritten to correct the noted informalities. Accordingly, no further objection on that basis is anticipated.

New Claims 16-25 are fully supported by the specification, drawings and claims as originally filed. For example, Claim 16 is supported by Figs. 1-4, the specification, page 10, lines 7-13, page 17, lines 6-7, page 24, lines 26-27; Claim 17 is supported by the specification, page 4, lines 7-8; Claim 18 is supported by the specification, page 4, lines 17-19; Claim 19 is supported by the specification, page 7, lines 17-18; Claim 20 is supported by the specification, page 25, lines 13-14; Claim 21 is supported by the specification, page 25, lines 26-29; Claim 22

is supported by the specification, page 27, lines 1-2; Claim 23 is supported by the specification, page 25, line 34 to page 26, line 1; Claim 24 is supported by the specification, page 24, lines 27-28; and Claim 25 is supported by the specification, page 25, lines 1-2. Applicants therefore submit that no new matter has been introduced.

Briefly recapitulating, Claim 16 is directed to a process for producing a ceramic heater. For example, referring to the non-limiting embodiment of Figs. 1-3, in this process, a resistance heating element 12 is formed on a surface of a ceramic substrate 11. The resistance heating element 11 is divided into plural sections 12a, 12b, 12c and 12d. Resistivities of the plural sections 12a, 12b, 12c and 12d are measured, respectively. Each of the plural sections 12a, 12b, 12c and 12d is trimmed according to a comparison between the resistivities of the plural sections 12a, 12b, 12c and 12d.

In the present invention recited in Claim 16, the resistance heating element is divided into plural sections, resistivities of the plural sections are measured, respectively, and each of the plural sections is trimmed according to a comparison between the resistivities of the plural sections. Therefore, a ceramic heater which has an improved temperature uniformity on the heating surface of the ceramic heater can be provided.

The Office Action asserts that Makino discloses a ceramic substrate, and a resistance heating element formed on the substrate wherein trimming is performed on resistance heating element.

However, Makino fails to disclose that the resistance heating element is divided into plural sections, resistivities of the plural sections are measured, respectively, and each of the plural sections is trimmed according to a comparison between the resistivities of the plural sections. Accordingly, Makino is not believed in any way to anticipate the specific features recited in Claim 16.

The Office Action asserts that JP4-249090 discloses trimming on a side face or surface

Application No. 10/070,443
Reply to Office Action of October 3, 2003

of the resistance heating element. The Office Action further asserts that Caddock '162 discloses a resistance element formed by trimming a part of a parallel circuit. However, none of the cited references discloses that the resistance heating element is divided into plural sections, resistivities of the plural sections are measured, respectively, and each of the plural sections is trimmed according to a comparison between the resistivities of the plural sections. Therefore, Claim 16 is believed to be allowable.

Substantially the same arguments as set forth above with regard to Claim 16 also apply to dependent Claims 17-25, which depend directly from Claim 16. Accordingly, each of the dependent claims is also believed to be allowable.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Masayasu Mori
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 47,301

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/03)

MM:jm
I:\USER\MSMORI\BIDEN\221014\221014_AME.DOC